

children's author. I am deeply saddened that Shel Silverstein passed away at the age of 66 in Key West, Florida, on May 10, 1999. We mourn the loss of a man whose legacy will be remembered for years to come.

Mr. Silverstein is best known for his children's poetry, but I think it is safe to say that his poetry is enjoyable to adults as well. I, myself, am quite familiar with his works, as my daughter Danielle is a big fan of his poetry. Indeed, I am sure that many of my colleagues would recognize his work which includes *Falling Up*, *A Light in the Attic*, and *Where the Sidewalk Ends*.

Over the course of his career, Shel Silverstein won numerous awards for his work, including the Michigan Young Readers Award for *Where the Sidewalk Ends*. His books, which Shel illustrated himself, are packed with humor and colorful characters, and sold over 14 million copies throughout the course of his life. This is truly a testament to the widespread appeal of his work.

Though books such as the *Giving Tree* were the catalyst which led to Shel Silverstein's international acclaim, few people realize that Shel began his career in the 1950s while serving with the United States armed forces in Japan and Korea. While stationed overseas, Mr. Silverstein began drawing cartoons for "Stars and Stripes," the American military publication.

Apart from his success as a writer of poetry, Shel Silverstein was also successful in his attempts to write country-western music. In 1969, Johnny Cash made the Silverstein-penned tune "A Boy Named Sue" into a bonafide hit. Loretta Lynn made Shel's song "Ones on the Way" famous as well. In 1980, Shel even recorded an album of his own called "The Great Conch Train Robbery." This title clearly shows Shel's fondness for his home in Key West, as the title references the car of his friend Buddy Owen, owner of B.O.'s Fish Wagon, one of Shel's favorite places to eat.

Mr. Speaker, while Shel Silverstein's passing is a tremendous loss for our nation and the world, I can say without hesitation that his kindness and generosity will be missed especially by the Key West community. He was an extraordinary human being, but we are lucky to have so many wonderful memories of his life and work.

HONORING SISTER BRIGID DRISCOLL

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1999

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join in honoring sister Brigid Driscoll, President of Marymount College, who, as a prominent figure from my district, has been a role model for the espousal of women's education for the last forty years. Sister Brigid, who will be retiring from her position in June, has devoted her life to Marymount College, establishing its solid foundation within the educational arena and the greater Tarrytown, New York community.

For more than twenty years as its president, and before that as an administrator and faculty member, Sister Brigid's visionary leadership

has overseen Marymount's transformation from a homogeneous liberal arts college exclusively for women, to an institution that maintains a strong focus on women, while serving an inclusive population of adult and international students. She has been recognized as an outspoken supporter of state and federal financial assistance for students, as well as a public policy advocate for independent higher education.

Among Sister Brigid's many contributions to Marymount was her vision for an educational setting that would enable many people in the surrounding communities to reach their full potential through education. In 1975, Sister Brigid founded Marymount Weekend College, one of the country's first full bachelor's degree programs for working women and men exclusively in the weekend format.

Sister Brigid's leadership and interest in the community is far reaching, as is her service and expertise in the field of education. Currently, she serves as a board member of First American Bankshares, Inc., the Westchester County Association, and as a member of Women's Forum, a group of 300 leading women in the professions, arts, and business in New York whose membership is by invitation only. In the educational sector, her present directorships include Saint Mary's College in Notre Dame, Indiana, Marymount School in New York City, the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, and the New York State Commission of Independent Colleges and Universities.

In the past, Sister Brigid has served on the board of Axe-Houghton funds, the Statue of Liberty/Ellis Island Commission, the United Way of American Second Century Initiative, the National Board of Girl Scouts USA, Governor Mario Cuomo's task force on the General Motors Plant Closing in Tarrytown, and Governor George Pataki's Transition Team for Education. Her previous directorships include the Council of Independent Colleges, the Westchester Education Coalition, and the Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities, where she also served as a representative to the Consultation on the Apostolic Constitution on Catholic Universities in Rome.

Recently, the issue of gender bias in America classrooms has sparked a national advertising campaign supporting women's achievements in education. Sister Brigid served on the committee of the Women's College Coalition that approved the creative content for the national campaign. Before the idea of this campaign was ever conceived, Marymount College, with the full support of Sister Brigid, responded to the challenge of making the educational needs of all women and girls a priority by creating the Marymount Institute for the education of women and girls, an organization offering workshops to educators and parents in the area of gender equity.

For her dedicated and distinguished service in many areas of professional and community life, Sister Brigid has been honored by the Westchester Chapter of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, the Sleepy Hollow Chamber of Commerce, and the Saint Jude's Habilitation Institute. Governor George Pataki honored her earlier this year with the Governor's Award for Excellence from the New York State Division of Women.

Honorary Doctorates of Humane Letters have been bestowed on Sister Brigid by Siena College and Marymount Manhattan College

which, in addition, presented her with the Alumni Association Award for Distinguished Life Achievement. Now, at the close of the millennium, Marymount College has conferred upon its esteemed leader the Honorary Degree of Doctor of Humane Letters. Finally, in a ceremony later this month, Sister Brigid will be granted an Honorary Doctorate of Humane Letters by the College of New Rochelle.

After hearing this brief portrait of a remarkable woman, I know that my colleagues will want to join me in honoring and commending Sister Brigid Driscoll for her many achievements. I am confident that she will remain a vital component of Marymount's commitment to achieving equality of opportunity for women.

We join with Sister Brigid's many friends, students and admirers in wishing her good health and happiness in her retirement.

INTRODUCTION OF THE CITIZEN LEGISLATURE AND POLITICAL FREEDOM ACT

HON. JOHN T. DOOLITTLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1999

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, today Majority Whip TOM DELAY and I are joining the chorus of calls in Congress for campaign finance reform because we agree that the current system is broken. There is something fundamentally wrong with the way political campaigns in America today are financed.

However, the reforms encompassed in the bill we are introducing today take a very different direction than most bills that have been introduced on campaign finance thus far. These bills share a common thread—they call for more government regulation into federal campaigns.

I believe that the proposals that call for greater regulation of our campaign finance system misdiagnose the problem. I submit that what has caused our failed campaign finance system is the regulation itself. If we want to deal with the real, underlying problem, we need to undo the regulations.

The Doolittle-Delay approach is the proper remedy to what ails our campaign finance system in that it removes the regulations. Moreover, and no less important, is that this approach is consistent with the Constitution because it restores our first amendment right to engage in political speech.

In 1974, in the wake of Watergate, Congress threw a regulatory web over the campaign finance system, a system that had gone largely unregulated throughout our nation's history.

Within two years of the reform's passage, the Supreme Court, in *Buckley versus Valeo*, struck down major parts of the new regulatory scheme on first amendment grounds.

Since that time, the campaign finance regulators have blamed every problem involving campaign financing on the Court's decision. There are those of us, however, who believe the problem is not that which the Court struck down, but rather that which was left intact, the present campaign finance law.

The regulators would do well to remember that it was not the Supreme Court that put unreasonably low limits on how much individuals and groups could contribute to campaigns

while failing to index those limits for inflation. It was not the Supreme Court that ran roughshod over the first amendment rights of office-seekers and other citizens. And it was not the Supreme Court that stacked the deck against challengers, locking in incumbents at an unprecedented rate. No, the problem is not that the Court invalidated part of the regulators; grand scheme; the problem is that too much of their scheme remains intact.

I believe it is time we declare "the emperor has no clothes." It's time to dispel the myths perpetuated by the architects of today's failed campaign finance scheme. And while the regulators devise new such schemes on how to limit participation in elections and eliminate money from campaigns, we should look at the real problems that have been caused by their regulatory approach to reform.

Today's campaign finance system requires current and prospective office-holders to spend too much time raising money and not enough time governing and debating issues. The present system has also failed to make elections more competitive and allows millionaires to purchase congressional seats. While a millionaire can write a check for whatever amount he or she wants to their election campaign, everyone else is forced to live under the same hard dollar limits that were put in place in 1974, which have not even been adjusted for inflation.

Today's system hurts voters in our republic by forcing more contributors and political activists to operate outside of the system where they are unaccountable and, consequently, less responsible. The big government reformers agree with me on this point, but their solution, of course, is more regulation. Beyond being unconstitutional, more regulation, such as banning soft money and limiting issue ads (ala Shays-Meehan), will only make the system worse. I don't often agree with my hometown newspaper, the Sacramento Bee, but last year they put out an editorial on CFR which I agreed with on many points. Speaking about the Shays-Meehan bill they said: "It centers on two big wrong-headed reforms: prohibiting national political parties from collecting or using 'soft-money' contributions, and outlawing independent political advertising that identifies candidates within 60 days of a federal election. That means the law would prohibit issue campaigning at precisely the time when voters are finally interested in listening—hardly congruent with free speech. Since that kind of restriction is likely to be tossed by the courts as a violation of constitutional free speech guarantees, the net effect of the changes will be to weaken political parties while making the less accountable 'independent expenditure groups' kings of the campaign landscape."

I couldn't agree more. Because as long as we have a shred of a Constitution left, individuals will have the ability to act independently and spend as much as they have want on po-

litical causes. So, the net result of a Shays-Meehan bill would be to push political spending even farther away from the responsible candidate-centered campaign.

These are the problems we face today. And before we decide which reforms should be implemented, we need to decide where we want to go, and what kind of new system we wish to create.

To me, the answer is simple. Our goal should be a system that encourages political speech, and promotes freedom and a more informed electorate. We should strive for a system in which any American citizen can compete for and win elective office; a system that is consistent with the Constitution by allowing voters to contribute freely to the candidate of their choice.

By removing the limits on contributions, scrapping the failed presidential finance system, and providing full and immediate disclosure, the Citizen Legislature and Political Freedom Act would dramatically move us toward a desirable, constitutional, and workable campaign finance system.

HOLT-LUCAS-MOORE "LOCK-BOX"
WILL PROTECT SOCIAL SECURITY
AND MEDICARE

HON. RUSH D. HOLT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1999

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer, along with my colleagues, Representatives LUCAS and MOORE, legislation to safeguard two of our nation's most important programs for the elderly, Social Security and Medicare.

As I travel around my central New Jersey District, I hear constantly from people who rely on Social Security and Medicare. Congress has no greater domestic priority this year than strengthening and protecting Social Security and Medicare. Our bill would ensure that that priority is recognized in law.

The Holt-Lucas-Moore Social Security and Medicare "lock-box" would require that every penny of the entire budget surplus, not just the Social Security surplus, be saved until legislation is enacted to strengthen and protect Social Security and Medicare.

Any new spending increases would have to be fully offset until solvency has been extended for Social Security by 75 years and for Medicare by 30 years. This requirement would be enforced by new points of order against any budget resolutions or legislation violating this condition.

My colleagues and I believe that spending any projected budget surpluses before protecting and strengthening Social Security and Medicare would be wrong. Projected budget surpluses over the next decade offer a once-

in-a-lifetime opportunity for addressing the challenges that Social Security and Medicare face. This hard-won achievement resulted from responsible steps that were taken in the past. We should not deviate from the path of responsibility now, with problems looming over the horizon for Social Security and Medicare. In fact, we should follow the old adage to "fix our roofs when the sun is shining." This is in keeping with what the President has proposed.

Some portion of the surpluses outside of Social Security and Medicare will be needed to address the challenges that those programs will face. Thus, we should save Social Security and Medicare first before squandering any of the Social Security surplus, the Medicare surplus or any other government surplus.

Furthermore, paying off the public debt can make an important indirect contribution to the sustainability of Social Security and Medicare. Virtually all economists, including Federal Reserve Chairman Greenspan, argue that paying down the public debt would increase national savings, promote long-run economic growth and create a larger future economy to support a larger, retired population. Fiscal discipline has served our economy well in recent years by helping to sustain the longest peacetime expansion in United States history.

We are offering this proposal now because we are concerned about the carelessness with which some Social Security "lock-box" proposals are being brought to the floor, completely bypassing the normal committee process. Proposals to protect and strengthen Social Security and Medicare deserve thorough examination and careful consideration. Congress should not take short-cuts when considering changes to these hallmark programs for America's seniors.

For example, Congress is expected to consider this week the Herger-Shaw "lock-box" bill, which offers only the minimum protection for Social Security and Medicare. While Herger-Shaw does attempt to protect the Social Security surplus, merely doing this does nothing to extend solvency for Social Security, and it does nothing at all for Medicare. The Holt-Lucas "lock-box" is superior to Herger-Shaw because its lock-box is more secure and has more money in it. Holt-Lucas saves the entire surplus, not just the Social Security surplus.

Mr. Speaker, Social Security and Medicare are some of the most important and successful programs of the 20th Century. We must not forget that they provide vitally important protections for American seniors. A majority of workers have no pension coverage other than Social Security, and more than three fifths of seniors receive most of their income from Social Security.

Let's put the need of America's current and future retirees first